UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

A DOCTOR SPEAKS OUT AGAINST EUTHANASIA!

M. Coleman Harris

The Cultural Values of Racial Minorities - - - - - - - *Jacob J. Weinstein*

Man Goes to Jail - - *O. A. Hammand*

The Seattle People's Church - *Fred W. Shorter*

VOLUME CXXI NUMBER 12

Chicago, August 15, 1938

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly Until Further Notice — *Subscription $3.00 Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* — CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. IDA S. RANDALL
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 179

ARTICLES—

A Doctor Speaks Out Against Euthanasia!—M. COLEMAN HARRIS 182

The Cultural Values of Racial Minorities—JACOB J. WEINSTEIN 186

Man Goes to Jail—O. A. HAMMAND 188

The Seattle People's Church—FRED W. SHORTER 190

THE STUDY TABLE—

In Honor of Rufus Jones
A Regional Novel —C. A. HAWLEY 191

Augustus—ROBERT SCHALLER 192

THE FIELD—

Land of the Pilgrims' Pride—New York *Herald-Tribune* 178

Keep America Out of War 192

Automobile Speeding 192

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Land of the Pilgrims' Pride

The complaint often is made, laboriously and at great length, that foreign newspapers and magazines in their treatment of news of affairs in the United States have a tendency to stress the bizarre, the trivial, and the cockeyed, to the exclusion of serious and important matters. Thus, the indictment runs, the foreigner gets a wholly distorted impression of this country. Well, let's see:

A flour salesman gets the Democratic nomination (tantamount, as the politicians say, to election) for Governor of the largest state in the Union by running on a platform consisting of the Golden Rule and the Ten Commandments and with the aid of a hillbilly band and a Confederate flag. Mrs. Evalyn Walsh McLean, of Washington, wears the Hope diamond, worth somewhere around $200,000, to a prizefight in a New York baseball park between a Negro and a German. The Vice-President of the United States, who is favored by some politicians as the next President, has never expressed himself publicly on any issue. The most highly paid reporter in the United States achieved his prominence principally by writing about women who were going to have babies and about couples who were not getting along well together. A man named Lapham, irked by the refusal of surgeons to amputate two malformed toes, takes a cold chisel and mallet and performs the operation upon himself. A lawyer known as "Dixie" Davis, defendant in one of the most important criminal trials in a generation, is permitted to leave Tombs prison to visit his girl friend. Men in the tall timber near Seattle are accused of setting forest fires in order to obtain employment putting them out. Judson Van Arsdale, in Matawan, N. J., takes four weeks to make up his mind which of two women, who had been living in his house and competing with each other at cooking and housework, he wants to marry. The American Indian is breeding more prolifically than any other racial group in the U. S. A New York court clerk works for three years without receiving any pay. The President of the United States is cruising among the Galapagos Islands. Sinclair Lewis, who once won the Nobel Prize for literature, is an actor in a country theater in Massachusetts. The government buries its gold in a hole in the ground in Kentucky. A woman, rebuked by her husband at the Delaware Park Racetrack for paying too much attention to another man, replies: "Well, we didn't ask him to give us no horse and he give us a horse and the horse win, so why shouldn't I feel goodwilly to him?"

We're doing all right, in short—the same pleasant, slightly mad people we've always been. Why worry because the poor, dull nations of the world like to read about us?

New York *Herald-Tribune.*

(*Continued on page* 192)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXI MONDAY, AUGUST 15, 1938 No. 12

THE WAY TO PEACE

Would you end war?
Create great Peace. . . .

The Peace that demands all of a man,
His love, his life, his veriest self;
Plunge him into the smelting fires of a work that becomes his child.

Give him a hard Peace; a Peace of discipline and justice. . . .
Kindle him with vision, invite him to joy and adventure;
Set him to work, not to create things,
But to create man;
Yea, himself.

Go, search your heart, America . . .
Turn from the machine to man,
Build, while there is yet time, a creative Peace. . . .

While there is yet time!
For if you reject Peace,
As surely as vile living brings disease,
So surely will your selfishness bring war.

JAMES OPPENHEIM.

BRIGHT SPOTS

It's easy enough to find the dark spots on the map these days. These spots are large, and so dark that they rivet the attention of the world with horror and foreboding. The vast area of *China,* for example—millions of humble and helpless people caught in the clutch of hideous death. Add to China *Spain,* and to Spain *Palestine,* and to these three *Ethiopia* still writhing in agony against extinction. Then there are *Italy, Germany,* and *Japan,* the Fascist strongholds, and various tyrannical countries of southeastern Europe where multitudes are miserable and afraid. But maps are traditionally of more than one color—there are bright spots in the world as well as black. Let us look at them for our soul's cheering! First, we list the Scandinavian democracies, so-called—DENMARK, SWEDEN, NORWAY, ICELAND, and FINLAND—where people are free, live simple and secure lives, and are undivided by political feuds, religious hatreds or racial prejudices. If there are any brighter spots in the solar system than these, we do not know what they are. Next we name the UNITED STATES and CANADA. The unarmed frontier between these two great states is itself enough to make them radiant, but we must add also the general internal conditions of high living standards, public comfort and convenience, and liberty. Then there are the far Pacific lands of AUSTRALIA and NEW ZEALAND, pure democracies, removed from war, and rid of class dissensions and abuses. To these add INDIA, emerging triumphantly from her long and heroic struggle for freedom—a victory won without resort to violence and bloodshed. India immediately suggests another country on the other side of the world from her—IRELAND, her seven hundred years of suffering ended, as a free and happy people work out slowly but surely their new destiny. Then there are the SOUTH AFRICAN REPUBLICS, which need fear no menace of war, and have long since learned the lessons of democracy. Also there is SOUTH AMERICA, where a large group of nations are banishing war from a whole continent—witness the recent decision to settle the Chaco dispute by arbitration!—and learning, however painfully, and with whatever setbacks as in Brazil, the ways of liberty. To all these bright spots we would add RUSSIA and MEXICO, where, amid whatever darkness in the present hour, a new day is dawning for mankind. And finally, of course, ENGLAND and FRANCE—the nations at home, apart from the empires abroad which they have builded. Look at the map—it's brighter than it is dark! Though the cause of humanity were wholly lost in western Europe and eastern Asia—and it is not going to be!—still would humanity survive, free, prosperous, happy.

BATTLESHIPS

President Roosevelt has postponed the building of the super-battleships provided for in the huge naval bill passed by the last Congress. This is good news—the first halt in the madness of armaments now possessing the world! Perhaps, if the United States thus holds up a bit, other nations may do the same. Once get *dis*armament started, on however small a scale, and it is our conviction that the process would proceed as rapidly as the *contra* policy of armament. Nations, as well as men and monkeys, are mere imitators, and once get a policy going, and it goes like the latest fashion in women's hats. Incidentally, we'd like to know the reasons behind this wise decision of our President *not* to proceed with a program on which he had set his

heart. Can it be that doubts as to the efficacy of battleships in this day of submarines and bombing-planes are beginning to creep into the minds of the naval experts? It seems impossible—General Hart, the great British military authority has said that there is only one thing harder to do than to get a new idea into the military mind, and that is to get an old idea out! But the lay mind, ruled by common sense, has long since seen that these floating fortresses can now only serve as excellent targets for bombs beneath the sea or in the air, and it may be—*mirable dictu!*—that the naval experts are catching up. Then there is the matter of expense—this may be daunting even a New Dealer! An ordinary battleship today costs between $60,000,000 and $65,000,000. One of these super-battleships would cost not less than $100,000,000. That seems quite a sum of money to put into a single vessel which can be sent to the bottom of the sea in ten seconds by a bomb costing not more than $1,000, and which in any case will be obsolete and thus ready for the scrap heap in a dozen years. One has only to ponder facts of this kind for a moment to realize that the whole navy idea, in this age of mechanical invention and vast explosives, is insanity of the worst description. It looks as though Washington had been doing some of this pondering. If so, the President is to be praised and thanked for having the courage to act upon such pondering.

FIGHT FOR CIVIL LIBERTIES

The fight for civil liberties is a never-ending one. In this field, more than in any other which we know, eternal vigilance is imperative. For example! Last month in New Jersey, the state of Mayor Hague, a high-placed judge, Vice-Chancellor Berry, declared from the bench that free speech is not a "right" at all, but only a "special privilege granted by the Constitution." As a mere privilege, of course, free speech may at any time be limited, or taken away altogether. The only "rights" which are absolute are those which are inherent in the very nature of man himself, and chief among these, says this New Jersey legal light, is the right to hold property. The "natural and inalienable rights" which it is the primary duty of government to protect "are essentially property rights"—and to these, if necessary or advisable, the right of free speech must be sacrificed! It is impossible to conceive of any dictum more contradictory of all established law and ethics than this. Yet from judges of a certain stripe, this is what we have to expect. But another recent utterance on this same subject is *not* what we have to expect! We refer to an article in a recent issue of the *New Republic* by Heywood Broun, entitled "Free Speech with Reservations." Mr. Broun, a one-time liberal, is troubled because the American Civil Liberties Union is fighting the infringement of the Labor Relations Board on the civil liberties of employers in their relations with labor. He cannot see why we should be worried about, least of all fight for, the right of employers to free speech. This right is not of any importance since the employers are not underdogs and may well be left to fight their own battles. At bottom, of course, Mr. Broun is rather glad than otherwise that employers are denied free speech by the Labor Board, for that is all to the good of labor, is it not? That there is involved here a matter of principle, a basic *right* belonging to all citizens whosoever, and if denied to any denied to all, never seems to enter his head. Even the liberal forces of this country, in other words, are cracking and crumbling in their support of "the rights of man." The more patient and persistent therefore must be those who still believe in liberty without reservations!

THE CHICKENS COME HOME TO ROOST

At the recent meeting of the American Bar Association, in Cleveland, a resolution was introduced by an ex-President of the Association, Charles C. Burlingham, censuring the Nazi persecutions of minority groups in Germany. This resolution was not passed because it involved "the present civil government of a foreign country," to quote the words of the resolutions committee. Describing this incident in a special news despatch, the correspondent of the New York *Herald-Tribune* wrote:

> Several Bar Association members commented privately that the organization could hardly censure racial discrimination by others so long as it continued to bar Negroes from membership in the Association.

To those uninformed upon the situation, it must seem incredible that the American Bar Association is closed to Negro lawyers. Yet such is the case! The late James Weldon Johnson, for example, whose tragic death was mourned by whites and blacks alike this summer, was not, because he could not be, a member of the Association, though he was a lawyer in honorable standing who had represented his country as a consul in Venezuela and Nicaragua. Mr. Johnson was only one of thousands of Negroes in the law against whom the Bar Association draws the color line. In so far as it is able, that is, the Association outlaws Negroes from American life, denies them all equal rights and privileges, and thus condemns them to the status of an oppressed minority group. What wonder that the organization had to find some plausible reason for turning down a resolution which condemned the Nazis for doing to Jews precisely what the American Bar Association within the limits of its power itself does to Negroes! The chickens have certainly come home to roost when a great body of American citizens, members of a distinguished profession, are rendered incompetent to protest against injustice by the injus-

tice of which they themselves are guilty. Nor should our lawyers, incidentally, be forced to take all the blame upon this issue. What about other groups here in America, including churches, which slam their doors in the face of Negroes, and Jews, and other more or less despised minorities? What can *they* say about the Nazis? It may be well to remember that in addition to the old adage about chickens coming home to roost, there is another saying about people living in glass houses not throwing stones.

DEATHS BY ALCOHOL

On a certain day not long ago a curious report was issued by Repeal Associates, purporting to show that drunken driving conditions were worse under Prohibition than they are today under repeal. The source of this so-called "study," an organization devoted to the interests of the "wets," raised suspicions at once of its accuracy—suspicions immediately confirmed and magnified by the fantastic figures presented out of a superficial and obviously biased inquiry. Now it happened that, on the very day this report was published, there was published a genuinely scientific and utterly sensational report of drunken driving by the Medical Examiner of New York City. This report showed that 40 per cent of all the persons killed in New York highway accidents had been drinking alcoholic beverages. This figure included both pedestrians and automobile drivers. Of the former group, 36 per cent, under autopsy examination, showed "traces or more" of alcohol, and 34 per cent showed "one plus or more." ("One plus" indicates that a man is definitely under the influence of liquor.) "On the basis of these figures," comments the Medical Examiner, "it is safe to say that at least one of every three pedestrians killed in highway accidents . . . had been drinking." Of the drivers killed, 54 per cent were found to have traces of alcohol, and 44 per cent had "one plus or more." In other words, more than one-half of these victims at the wheel had been drinking, and nearly one-half had been imbibing freely. These statistics of course apply to only one city, but the Medical Examiner rightly states that, pending similar inquiries in other cities, "we can only assume that the results would be similar in other large metropolitan centers." That drunken driving in Prohibition days was responsible for any such dreadful results as these is of course ridiculous. Repeal Associates and other "wet" organizations are obviously worried, else they would not be making these so-called "studies," and setting up fantastic tests to prove their own case. With liquor available in every restaurant and lunch-counter, in every roadhouse and wayside tavern, in many homes, the menace of drunken driving is increasing steadily. When the facts really become known, automobilists themselves will be the first to demand that "booze" again be banned.

QUESTIONS OF ETHICS

A young man named Corrigan flew across the Atlantic Ocean last month under conditions so sensational as to attract the attention of the world. In doing so, (1) he deliberately broke a law enacted by the nation forbidding free-lance ocean flying of this description, (2) deceived the flying officials in New York who were his hosts, and (3) when he had landed in Ireland, lied about his exploit in detail and *in extenso*. All this was forgotten, or ignored, in the excitement over Corrigan's achievement and in admiration of the gallantry and modesty of the young man himself. What shall we say about these matters? What are the ethics involved? A few weeks later, a mentally deranged young man, named Warne, climbed out on an eighteenth story window ledge of the Hotel Gotham in New York, and for eleven hours held a city spellbound as from moment to moment he tottered upon the edge of the abyss below him. He finally plunged in the darkness to his destruction. During the hours when he was precariously perched upon the ledge, every expedient imaginable was resorted to in endeavors to persuade the pitiful young man to return to safety. Among other things, lies were concocted to deceive him, as when a police officer posed as a hotel clerk, who would lose his job if the young man jumped to the sidewalk. Were these lies justifiable? Is it right to tell a falsehood in order to accomplish some good end? A recent book, highly interesting and ethically important, has been published on this very subject. It is written by that famous physician and teacher of Boston, Dr. Richard C. Cabot, and is entitled *Honesty*. In this book, the author argues that a lie is never justifiable, and illustrates his thesis from an abundance of experience as a man and a medical practitioner. In his discussion, he avoids no issue, evades no embarrassing dilemma. He answers just such riddles as these recently propounded in the day's news. We commend this volume to our readers. It provides a much-needed moral tonic to an age grown indifferent and even cynical on all questions of principle and ideals.

ARE FREETHINKERS "REDS"?

An amusing and in its way significant controversy has been raging in England. This controversy was innocently precipitated by the forthcoming International Congress of Freethinkers in London. No sooner was this Congress announced than excited demands were made upon the Home Secretary, Sir Samuel Hoare, a Quaker, to ban the meeting. Sir Samuel, in accordance with the basic traditions of English liberty, to say nothing of his own personal faith, has refused to take action, and the hounds of bigotry and prejudice have been loosed upon him. In Scotland, for example, the Laird of Abbotsford, Sir Walter Scott's descendant, has been stirring up the Catholic masses with the

charge that this Freethinkers Congress is "an insult to God"—as though God needed protection! This has been followed by the charge that British rationalists are tools of Stalin and the Communists in the interest of world revolution—as though rationalism did not outdate Communism by a number of generations! The Rationalist Association of England, of course, is composed of members of all political parties and all walks of life, and most of them are conservative rather than radical in their political views—certainly anti-Soviet. But this makes no difference! Thwarted by Sir Samuel Hoare, the bigots have now turned to Parliament, and there presented a bill to ban aliens from entering England as participants of the Congress. The whole thing is ridiculous, yet important as indicating the raging fury and fear of prejudice which are now at large in the world. When a thing of this sort can happen in *England,* what about the rest of the nations? What about ourselves? We suggest that the International Congress of Freethinkers arrange to hold their annual meeting next year in New York in connection with the World's Fair in that city, and thus test liberty here. We can't imagine that there would be opposition—yet, one never knows these days!

A Doctor Speaks Out Against Euthanasia!

M. COLEMAN HARRIS

Those who argue in favor of euthanasia predicate their case mainly upon the unwarranted assumption that physicians can always tell definitely when an individual has reached the incurable stage of an illness. In addition, euthanasia advocates choose to place upon the doctor the terrific burden and responsibility of determining and declaring which diseases are permanently incurable. This is often impossible. A few recent examples strikingly illustrate this fact.

One recalls immediately the case of General Pershing who, on February 25, 1938, was reported dying. On the 26th a slight improvement was noted; nevertheless, every bulletin issued by his physicians reported the apparent hopelessness of the General's recovery and indicated that death was imminent. His dear friends and relatives were summoned to make arrangements for the funeral and to prepare for his burial. Even provisions for transportation of the body were completed. The nation's press set their type in headlines, ready to print, in their early Sunday edition of February 27, the complete obituary of this famous man.

But the unexpected occurred. General Pershing did not die! Indeed, at the instant this article is being written, he is very much alive. The doctors—every one of them—were misled! Their prognostication of impending death evidently was wrong. Medicine is not an exact science, and it is just because errors are liable to occur, from time to time, even among the most experienced and capable of the medical profession, that euthanasia is impractical.

Another illustration. Many months ago in the fall of 1937, the present Pope of the Catholic Church was bedridden and suffering intensely. With hope for his recovery practically abandoned, death was all too apparent. But, lo and behold, Pope Pius did not die! As a matter of fact, he, too, at this very moment is alive and vital. Since his erroneously diagnosed "fatal illness" he has made several notable contributions to the religious life of his people.

These current examples can be supplemented by many others in the annals of medical history. All testify to the fact that doctors are not gods. Their power of prognostication is limited. They cannot always be sure that life is nearly ended with the accuracy necessary for the dubious employment of euthanasia. And, also, research is being carried on continually so that an incurable disease of today may be a curable disease of tomorrow. Though the research work itself is slow and plodding, actual announcements of the results are often made at short notice so that this statement may be taken literally. Only a short time ago, for instance, diabetes in children was considered hopeless. Then, almost overnight, the wonderful discovery of insulin by Dr. J. G. Banting was broadcast, bringing the glad tidings of a new lease on life to the sufferers. What an irretrievable wrong would have been committed had these diabetic youngsters been euthanized a few days preceding this important announcement!

As another example there is pernicious anemia. The diagnosis of pernicious anemia was once considered a death sentence. Individuals so afflicted steadily grew weaker despite numerous transfusions, finally slipping away. Then, one day, Dr. George Richards Minot published the results of his research with liver extract. Physicians everywhere immediately and eagerly grasped this new form of treatment. Soon, instead of losing strength and dying, patients gained strength and lived. What misgivings families would have suffered had euthanasia been practised and their loved ones sent to death but a short time before the discovery of this remarkable cure!

General paresis, a form of insanity accompanying the third stage of syphilis, for ages past, was considered incurable and hopeless. It formed the largest class of insanities to be found in most institutions for the care of the mentally deficient. A few years ago, however, it was discovered that injections of the malaria germ often cured the unfortunates so afflicted. Had "mercy killing" been in vogue, many individuals long ago would have passed into the great beyond, their usefulness lost forever.

In any discussion of euthanasia, cancer is inevitably brought up. Well—who knows what tomorrow will bring! Skin cancers already are being removed successfully with radium and X-ray, an impossibility a comparatively short time ago. In the early stage of the disease surgery is very successful, more particularly when the newly described

high frequency electric scalpel is used—that instrument which cuts off all channels by which cancerous growth might spread to other parts of the body. When, because of a late diagnosis, all this has been tried and failed, the patient, with drugs to ease the pain, should be allowed to live, to reap the benefit of whatever discovery may be unearthed at a moment's notice. With more effort being expended than ever before, more money and facilities at the disposal of the researcher, is it too much to expect that some morning before long we shall awaken to read of a bona fide cancer cure scientifically proven, accepted, and reported by the medical profession? We do not know when this may happen. Should this cure come on the morrow, could a family or their physician forgive themselves had they sentenced a loved one to death today!

Dementia praecox is another form of insanity usually considered absolutely incurable. It is only within the last twelve months that shock treatment with insulin has been found effective in restoring many of these deranged minds to normalcy. No longer can one say that "once an individual is admitted to an institution for the insane he never gets out." Now, more than ever before, there is hope for mental cases—the hope of cure. With research continually in progress one can reasonably expect that the future will be even more productive along these lines.

Heart diseases also are regarded in a different light today. Until MacKenzie and others enlightened the medical world, the victims, many of them young, were forbidden the normal activities of their years and were condemned to lives of chronic invalidism—useless, suffering, hopeless—perfect candidates for euthanasia. Practical observation and modern treatment aided by such mechanical instruments of precision as the electrocardiograph and X-ray now demonstrate that people with "heart trouble" can live long and useful lives.

One could continue with countless illustrations of cures that demonstrate "while there is life, there is hope." Since there is always this possibility, and whereas every individual differs in his reactions to drugs, it is impossible for any one to assert that *here is an incurable person—he should be euthanized!*

Those who would legalize euthanasia agree further that "there are a number of new-born babies condemned to a life of idiocy, feeble-mindedness, crime, and perversion, who should be euthanized at birth. Some doctors are now doing it, but it should be legalized."* This is incredible! What kind of doctor is this who would inject a poison into an infant, or strangle a child as it is born because he thinks the new-born babe may grow up to be an idiot, feeble-minded, addicted to crime or perversion! Who can decide this at birth? Who knows what heights or depths a new life may reach? What reputable physician would take it upon himself to snuff out the fire of life which he knows not all medical science can rekindle? Killing an infant as he draws his first breath assumes that parents want their child destroyed, should he not be a perfect specimen. This is not true. When a baby is born unfortunately deformed it is a natural reaction of parents and attending physicians to keep the child alive and correct the deformity. When this cannot be effected we often find these pathetic cases evoking the parents' greatest love and devotion, raising their nobility of affection to almost inconceivable heights.

In the relatively few cases of unusual monstrosities and unexplained child idiocy, the suggestion is offered that they should be made wards of the state, to be cared for properly and humanely, with every opportunity to broaden their intellect and increase their usefulness. Insanity accompanying old age should likewise be treated mercifully with the kindness and patience due these unfortunates to ease their remaining years. Many men —perfect subjects for euthanasia—are in institutions at present as a result of injuries sustained in the World War. Should they be killed off—these heroes of yesterday, useless today? Was it not enough that they fought in vain? Now that many at least realize the futility of war, should we add to the irony of their fate—premature death?

Certainly euthanasia for imbecilic individuals, or those whose mental processes are in any way deficient, is no solution of the problem at all. By killing off these weak, unwanted, and, for the most part, defenseless people, many of whom under proper guardianship make useful members of our society, we renounce our personal responsibility, seek to evade our moral obligation, repudiate our former provision for adequate care, discourage scientific progress, and deter research for prevention, cause, and cure. It is only recently that our government finally awakened to the fact that it owed an obligation to those in distress from unemployment and old age. Let us go a step further and continue that advance in thought by not forsaking those ill in mind and body, through no fault of their own.

Something must be wrong with a society if there are as many mentally deficient as the euthanists claim there are. There is no remedy, however, in "killing them off." Instead of pouring in money, utilizing energy, and wasting time urging the legalization of euthanasia, let the advocates thereof spend that same money, energy, and time in getting at the causes of this unwarranted condition and make that their program. Then they will be doing something constructive, whereas euthanasia is entirely destructive.

Clear up the slums! Make the world a decent place in which to live! Prevent exploitation of the masses! Give men and women opportunities to make a fair living wage that they may provide for themselves and families adequately! Protect them from malnutrition! Educate them regarding personal hygiene, the transmission of disease, the value of cleanliness! This is a program worth fighting for.

Practically, involuntary euthanasia, or for that matter voluntary euthanasia would be difficult to put into action. This is recognized by even the advocates for its legalization. Dr. C. K. Millard of England in the *English Review of Reviews,* writes:

> It is obvious that many ramifications would enter into the moral, legal, and religious responsibilities of such a procedure and that great care would have to be taken to guard against unscrupulous individuals who might attempt to carry out some plan for their own gain.

*Quoted from booklet entitled *Why Mercy Deaths?* published by the National Society for the Legalization of Euthanasia.

Charles Francis Potter, President of the National Society for the Legalization of Euthanasia in this country, suggested something of the same nature in his remarks quoted in the January 17th issue of the New York *Times*. He said that "unscrupulous and impatient heirs might use it to hasten the death of a wealthy person," but he hastily added that his laws will prevent that possibility. How can one be so sure? It is common knowledge that none of our laws is 100 per cent efficient. They are bound to be abused and misused. Loopholes are constantly being discovered and taken advantage of by unscrupulous individuals. What a dangerous law euthanasia would be to place upon our statute books —a law dealing with life and death!

Recently, during the insurance-medical fraud investigation in New York City, it was disclosed how easily some perfectly honorable, outstanding specialists were completely fooled and duped by well people who took certain drugs to produce symptoms simulating serious chronic diseases. Should these drugs be administered by ill-intentioned individuals, fraud could easily be invoked. This might well occur in the institution of euthanasia in cases where money were a factor, despite all attempts at regulation by law. The dead cannot talk!

Innumerable difficulties also arise in the matter of putting the judgment into action. How will the killing be arranged? Who will do it? Here is the plan advocated by the Euthanasia Legal Society:

> When all relations and two physicians decide and sign the document it is presented to a medical referee who must visit the invalid and each relative and friend to ascertain that there is no individual interest in the euthanasia and that everything is properly arranged. Then twelve other judges, (presumably physicians), must reach unanimous opinion of its ratification.

Recognizing that in all probability the patient would die a natural death before all this could be done and twelve doctors found to agree, the National Society in America has intimated that three doctors would be all that is necessary. They find it "difficult to believe that three physicians would conspire . . . to do away with a wealthy sufferer for the benefit of his relatives," and so are willing to cast aside the safeguards suggested by the English society, which are obviously so complicated and complex as to make euthanasia impractical. Although, on the whole, the medical profession is composed of conscientious men of high character, it must be admitted that, alas not unlike other professions, it too has its share of unscrupulous individuals who might find in this procedure a far more fertile field of activity than in performing illegal operations, falsifying testimony, or conspiring against insurance companies. And here, again, let us remember life is at stake.

Assuming, however, that collusion could be prevented, there still remains the matter of the actual killing itself, the killers, and the method of killing. Where are the executioners going to come from? Physicians?—well hardly! Ministers?—not likely! Magistrates?—inconceivable! A member of the family?—how ghastly!

What a difficult time most states have in engaging a man to pull the switch in a state penitentiary to exterminate the life of a criminal! This —at a good fee too. No one wants to do it. How much more terrible an act it would be to kill a weak, helpless individual who has committed no crime at all except to be born weak, or to be afflicted by a serious illness. This is debauchery to the nth degree!

Now for the method to be applied. The English society's recommendation in voluntary euthanasia is as follows:

> The usual method of administering euthanasia would be a lethal narcotic draught which might be given in a special utensil—the "lethal cup." A prescribed procedure would have to be followed, which would include an express statement by the euthanasor—that's the executioner—as to the object of the draught and a direct question to the applicant as to whether he was quite sure he wished to anticipate death! If his answer were in the affirmative the lethal cup would be handed to him or put within his reach. In cases where the patient is unable to swallow, the lethal cup could be administered hypodermically. An independent and official witness would need to be present, only persons of a certain status, as magistrates, clergymen, and doctors.

Such a proceeding is only comparable in its horror and ghastliness to the administration of death by the state in capital punishment. Notwithstanding the circumstances preceding its administration, the act itself and the end result are the same —the artificial interruption of life—in other words, death! Indeed, champions of euthanasia go so far as to admit that there is no essential difference between death in warfare and death by mercy killing —arguing that "since war is legal why not euthanasia?" Two wrongs do not make a right. War is always miserable business because it entails human destruction. Therefore all good men and women hate war and will have nothing to do with it. Enlightened public opinion recognizes that capital punishment is degrading and demoralizing, because it involves the taking of a life. For that reason most educated men and women oppose capital punishment. Euthanasia, too,—in spite of all vain attempts to soften its significance by questionable use of the word "mercy"—is still nothing more or less than the taking of life. However broken and shattered that life may be, euthanasia still remains a matter of killing, and killing in any form ever was and ever will be repugnant to civilized man, whether it be by nation, state, or individual.

The euthanists argue that we do not hesitate to kill animals—our pet dogs, for example—when they are very ill. It is true that we kill dumb animals. They are pets and we love them for what they are. But they are hardly comparable in our affection to the love we bear our mother, father, brother, sister, son, or daughter. Animals leave behind no treasured dear ones of their kind. Their exit is of no special significance to human society, so naturally we make it as speedy as possible. Furthermore, most animals are killed not so much to relieve their own suffering, as to relieve the owner's responsibility of taking care of a sick or crippled pet.

Most proponents of involuntary euthanasia have in mind individuals who are chronically ill with some so-called "incurable" disease accompanied by pain; individuals who, so to speak, have lost their usefulness to society, who because of their suffering, to quote Dr. Ellsworth Huntington, "can never find any pleasure in life or give any pleasure to others," as if pleasure is all there is

to life! No, not all who are exposed to invalidism want to die. Most people, even in the midst of extreme suffering, want to live. Clinging tenaciously to life they grasp at every "straw" which gives them hope. To the very end many fall into their dreamless sleep with the faith that relief will come and they will recover. It is better so! For, if it can be honorably avoided, who wants to tell a loved one of his impending departure? Imagine the tear on the heartstrings, waiting for that last moment of ultimate and permanent wordly separation! Picture an individual extremely ill, yet unaware of the serious significance of his condition. As he is visited and examined first by one physician, another, then a third, and so on—all within the course of a day or two (for if euthanasia is to be of any value at all it must be performed before natural death has a chance to catch up on the afflicted)—he realizes what is being planned by the family. With every drink that is offered, every medicament administered, agony turns to despair, suspicion to frustration. If such a scene is not vulgar and debasing, what indeed is the meaning of these words!

Those who urge the legalization of euthanasia not only advocate involuntary "mercy killing," but ask, in addition, that those who are suffering and desirous of anticipating death be allowed to do so by employing voluntary euthanasia. This, it should be emphasized, would mean simply the gaudy legalization of suicide by the State. It would encourage self-destruction and the abandonment of courage, hope, and faith. Under no conditions has suicide ever been justifiable as a desirable social measure. As a matter of fact its increase in rate is one of the first signs of a decaying civilization. Primarily it is an escape from life, a flight from reality, differing from other escapes, however, by being permanent instead of temporary.

In Dr. Karl Menninger's recent volume on this subject, cleverly entitled *Man Against Himself*, he prints this statement in italics (page 18), "no reality, however terrible, is unbearable." He goes on to state, (page 71), that

> anyone who has sat by the bedside of a patient dying from a self-inflicted wound and listened to pleadings that the physician save a life, the destruction of which had only a few hours or minutes before been attempted, must have been impressed by the paradox that one who wished to kill himself does not want to die.

It is often the result of a mistaken notion on the part of a depressed individual who feels it would be better if he were out of the way. When such an attempt fails, that same individual is glad it failed. This is primarily because a sufferer from a severe and prolonged illness, or a person in a deranged mental state, is in no condition to reason skillfully, to exercise calm judgment, or to appreciate fully the issues involved in his decision to put an end to his life.

The moral and ethical issues involved in voluntary euthanasia (suicide) must not be ignored. Here the evidence was long ago submitted and the case closed. Aristotle, the great philosopher of the age, wrote: "To die in order to avoid the pains of poverty, love, or anything that is disagreeable is not the part of a brave man but a coward." It is cowardice. Indeed, says Sir W. Temple, "By all human laws, as well as divine, self-murder has ever been agreed as the greatest crime." It is wrong! And Sir Thomas Browne declared: "Suicide is not to fear death, but yet to be afraid of life. It is a brave act of valor to condemn death; but when life is more terrible than death it is then the greatest valor to dare to live." Spinoza in proposition XVII in his *Ethics* says: "Those who commit suicide are powerless souls and allow themselves to be conquered by internal causes repugnant to their nature." The ethical implications are obvious! Finally, Schopenhauer, the world's most famous pessimist, in his *Studies in Pessimism*, writes: "Suicide thwarts the attainment of the highest moral aim by the fact that, for a real release from this world of misery, it substitutes one that is merely apparent." It is immoral!

Were suffering the sole criterion of who should be euthanized, the number would be legion. Misery, heartache, pain, and suffering are not confined merely to those who are old, ill, and about to die—but, alas, even in greater numbers to those who are young, well, and must live. Suffering in itself is hardly reason enough for euthanasia. Yet wherever possible, physicians endeavor to relieve pain, very particularly in the terminal stages of an "apparently" hopeless case. They are agreed on "easy dying," but not "easy death"; "merciful dying," not "mercy death." Surely the transition from life to death should be made as painless and serene as possible. For this purpose the free use of opiates, morphine, pantopon, and codeine, ether, and chloroform is liberally employed. Operative procedures may be necessary. Even the administration of cobra venom may be required. Only within the last few months this drug has been employed with great satisfaction, rendering suffering patients entirely free from pain, without any of the bad effects occasionally encountered with the use of other narcotics.

For those few cases where pain is unrelievable by medicaments and drugs, when life seems hopeless and living futile, what can one suggest? Nothing other than the employment of the fundamental verities of human existence, the ever-sustaining moral and ethical principles of life—courage, faith, and hope.

Surely there are many instances to illustrate that despite torture, pain, and distress, men and women physically disabled, but with courage, faith and hope, have conquered. Helen Keller is perhaps the greatest living example. Sir Walter Scott, Alexander Pope, Steinmetz, Roger Babson, Doctor Trudeau are others. An outstanding example is Robert Louis Stevenson—ill from birth, near death a dozen times, stricken on one occasion with a combination of pleurisy, malaria, and nervous exhaustion in combination with his chronic—then incurable—tuberculosis, but never once giving up the ship. At the weakest point of his life, lying in bed, hardly able to open his eyes, he took his pencil in hand and completed the delightful *Child's Garden of Verses*. The works of R. L. S. and the genius of those mentioned would never have flowered had euthanasia been in vogue when they were young, for surely they were perfect types for the act!

Picture, if you will, the demoralizing, degrading, and repugnant scene of a family discussing with a sufferer as to whether or not he should take

the lethal cup. Then contrast this picture with one of courageous fighting, grimly daring with strength and valor to the bitter end. Or contrast the final cowardly scene of a person eagerly grasping the lethal liquid, or accepting the poisonous injection, with the last hours of Captain Robert Scott, described in his own diary found, months after his ill-fated Antarctic expedition, beside his frozen body and the bodies of his two companions.

> Outside the door of the tent it remains a scene of whirling drift. I do not think we can hope for any better things now. We shall stick it out to the end, but we are getting weaker and weaker, and, of course, the end cannot be far. It seems a pity, but I do not think I can write anymore.—Had we lived, I should have had a tale to tell of the hardihood, endurance, and courage of my companions which would have stirred the heart of every Englishman. These rough notes and our dead bodies must tell the tale.

Indeed, there is an honorable way to die as there is to live. "The honorable end," wrote Spengler, "this is the one thing that cannot be taken from a man."

Life is a mystery. We are born, we live, we die. But it is not just birth, breath, and death. There are joys and there are sorrows; there are moments of great exultations. There are periods of deep despair. There are light-hearted days of happiness—love, home, and children. There are serious moments of blighted hopes, illness, and despair. Throughout life there are the memories of those who have gone before, not as cowards, slinking away in the darkness of night, drinking from a lethal cup or dying after a hypodermic needle of poison has been administered—but rather do we cherish the exalted memory of dear ones to whom we gave our all, for whom we exhausted every possibility that our finances would allow and medical skill could give to keep them with us, and who to the very end fought the fight of life with courage and endurance. This shall be our consolation throughout the years of separation.

Euthanasia is unscientific since it does not deal with either prevention, cause, or cure of disease. It is impractical and would lead to innumerable legal difficulties. It is unethical and immoral, and therefore degrading and debasing to society and to one's own self. A physician's duty and obligation to his fellow men are to prevent and cure disease, relieve suffering, ameliorate pain, and preserve life. From these ideals the medical profession will never stray!

The Cultural Values of Racial Minorities*

JACOB J. WEINSTEIN

If we use the term "racial minorities" in the broader sense in which it is commonly used so that it covers our immigrant population of different ethnic stocks and the first American-born generation of those immigrants, we are then considering a problem which is concerned with almost half the population of the United States and its possessions. To adjust and harmonize the cultural and social values of Negroes, Orientals, Mexicans, Indians, Italians, Jews, Poles, etc., it is first of all necessary to admit that the "Melting Pot" theory of Americanization is not adequate. That theory and the educational practice based upon it assumed that the Anglo-Saxon element constituted the "norm" of cultural possibility in America and that all other groups must conform to this norm or be satisfied with some secondary servile status by its side.

The cultural imperialism implicit in this attitude was hardly more noticed than the political prerogatives constantly assumed by the New Englanders because the "frontier" imposed a hearty though evanescent camaraderie in the nineteenth century.

When the East-European migrations had made the problem much more acute and the government was forced to abandon its laissez-faire attitude, the example of Balkanized Europe, the cockpit of the world, drove our Americanization authorities into a veritable sweat of regimentation. They expected the night school classes for adults and the citizenship examination to polish off all the foreign bumps and drop a shiny 100 per cent American into the hopper. The Indians were to be politely hidden on the Reservations, the Negroes would be veiled behind their skins, the Orientals would add a bit of color for sightseers, our Hawaiians and Filipinos would be covered by the canebrakes.

As early as 1910, there were lone voices in the wilderness, protesting the spiritual violence of this policy. Randolph Bourne was writing his essays on Trans-National America; John Dewey was considering the cultural obligations of an enlightened education; and Horace Kallen was pleading for the recognition in a democracy of the cultural integrity of the various groups. Settlement house workers began to realize that the folk art which they proudly exhibited to patrons had definite cultural roots which America was not tending. Henry Adams, the brilliant scion of the Anglo-Saxon keepers of the "norm," hungrily sought in the capitals of Europe the spiritual nourishment which ironically Europe was then so abundantly pouring into the lap of America. Henry Adams anticipated the expatriates and that wave of local artists and sophisticates who descended in turns on the pueblos, Harlem, and the ghetto, seeking a fourth dimensional quality which they found absent in their own lives. A few remained to wonder how America could preserve the cultural milieu out of which the fine arts of the minorities sprang.

These were some of the influences that brought to the fore cultural pluralism as the philosophic basis of the integration of the culture groups in America. This theory of adjustment contains significant implications for the various departments of our communal activity.

(1). *For government,* there is the implication that our minorities are entitled to real and not merely formal equality of the laws. With the conscious recognition that our racial and cultural groups contain the rich gifts of the spirit, our deportation laws will be humanized, our naturalization requirements modified. The protection of the Negro against the lynch spirit of the South, and the Japanese against the unjust land laws of California would be among the legislative by-products which must result from a wide acceptance of cultural

*This was the prize winning essay in the recent contest conducted by The New History Society, 132 East 65th Street, New York City, on the subject "How Can Cultural and Social Values of Racial Minorities in the United States and Its Outlying Possessions and Territories Be Adjusted and Harmonized?"

pluralism. Interested in what the Filipino might add to the sum total of our Western civilization, we shall not be satisfied with presenting him a political independence after we have distorted his native economy to satisfy our sugar interests. We will restore the Filipino to a land economy where he can grow to the full stature of his possibilities.

(2). *For education,* the implications of cultural pluralism are most wide. Our school textbooks must be rewritten, not alone to correct misinformation about minority groups but to encourage attitudes of active appreciation for differences. The Service Bureau for Education in Human Relations has made a splendid beginning in preparing such textbooks and in developing assembly programs and community projects to make the school and the community aware of the rich variety of cultural values in their midst.* The cinema and the radio must be shown the dramatic possibilities behind the names of Marian Anderson, Joe di Maggio, or Yehudi Menuhin. We are acquainted with the builders of physical America in the persons of the captains of industry. The history and the script writers are yet to be encouraged to tell the saga of the coolie and the Italian section gangs, of the Polish and Bohemian miners, of the Norwegian loggers, of the Yugoslavs and the Croats on the Masaba iron ranges. The Daughters of the American Revolution place neat plaques at every battlefield. Why should not the sons and daughters of the immigrants put up plaques where their fathers erected a giant bridge or broke the first furrow of untamed prairie or joined the glistening bands of steel across the vast chest of America?

We are familiar with the American success story. We are treated occasionally to such a story whose hero is an immigrant lad. But always there is the suggestion that the ladder of success draws one away from his group and into that Golden Valhalla where the dollar sign irons out all accents. We are yet to write the success story of a group—the group that gave Per Hansa his strength in *Giants on the Earth,* the group that sang and suffered to make the spirituals, the group that gave *Laughing Boy* the serenity which understandeth all things, the group which supplied the organizing genius behind the modern department store such as Macy's or a modern trade union such as the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. Our historical weakness for rugged individualism has induced us to look upon our minority groups as the incubators of occasional great individuals whom we have forthwith interpreted as sports or variants from the group. Now that we are coming upon days where collective responsibility is keenly needed, we may look more attentively to the folk sources from which these "sports" drew their genius.

(3). *Implications for Religion*: Miss Elin Andersen, in her fine study of Burlington, Vermont,** has shown how the Roman Catholic group insists on the parochial school, not only to preserve a mind-set more favorable to the tenets of the faith, but as well to preserve certain cultural forms which become bound up with a religion. The forms of Protestantism have been fairly well absorbed in the general American environment and therefore do not need special protection. The same fear is felt by Orthodox and Zionist Jews who feel that the essential folkways of Israel are not recognized in the general curriculum and must therefore be taught in separate schools. Mordecai Kaplan, in his *Judaism As a Civilization,** provides for an almost autonomous cultural set of institutions for Jews in America. This is an unfortunate divisive tendency and would not obtain the support of the various groups if they could feel that our schools would be as appreciative of their significant folkways as they are of the Protestant folkways.

(4.) *Implications for Industry*: H. A. Miller has often reminded us that the caste barrier is often a class barrier. Education and the slow tolerance which extends toward the familiar would in most cases overcome the primitive dislike of the unlike. But in our private profit economy, differences can be exploited to the advantage of the dominant group. Cultural and racial inferiority is often the counterpart of economic disadvantage. The California Farmers Association is not anxious to discover Diego Riveras or Orozcos among the lettuce and the pea pickers, since it is a bit indelicate to pay a Rivera a starvation wage and house him in a miserable tar-paper shanty.

In one of the schools of New Jersey, where the mothers were being enlisted in an effort to introduce appreciative attitudes between the various culture groups, a Negro mother arose and asked what good it was to praise the colored children for the music of Paul Robeson and Roland Hayes, while their mothers were receiving five and six dollars a week as domestics in white homes. "We can't preserve our self-respect on such wages, no matter how much you enjoy the Hal Johnson Choir in *Green Pastures,*" she said. Because of this tendency, Marxists have insisted that there could be no genuine cultural tolerance without a degree of economic freedom impossible under capitalism. They point to the cultural pluralism of the U. S. S. R. as a proof of their thesis. There is a definite question as to the nature of the economic freedom in Russia today, but there can be no question that the Bolsheviks tapped a tremendous reservoir of human energy when they decided to recognize and encourage the cultural autonomy of the 150 nationalities of the former Russia. During a recent visit, the writer saw Jews, Tartars, Georgians, Ukrainians and Volga-Germans caught up in a mighty pageant of construction, enduring incredible hardships cheerfully because they felt respect had been accorded to a group label which had formerly been despised. The present centralizing tendencies of the Stalin regime may dampen this fresh creative ardor, but they will not destroy the validity of the new cultural policy. Seventy millions of people were converted from the raw material of Russification to high-hearted citizens. When one sees what the Uzbeks or the Khirgiz have done in the short twenty years of this new policy, one cannot help but be impatient with America's blindness to the powerful creative veins in the layers of its own population.

Industrial democracy is a very essential support of true cultural democracy but one does not have to wait upon the other. The approach must be made to both goals at once. Industrial democracy in the trade unions of the South is handicapped by the strong factor of race prejudice. The organization of unskilled labor has long been delayed by the more or less manipulated antagonism of the American worker against the foreigner. The International Ladies Garment Workers

*See the mimeographed classroom material as used by a series of schools selected for experimentation by the Service Bureau, 503 W. 121st St., New York City.

**_We Americans,_ Harvard University Press. Cambridge, Mass., 1937.

*Published by The Macmillan Company, New York, 1934.

Union has discovered that it is very important for its Italian members to understand why Orthodox Jews do not eat pork and for Jews to understand the discipline of the Lenten season. The appreciation of each group for the cultural values of the others is a definite aid toward their proper integration into our economic system—while conversely better conditions of work will release great creative possibilities from our working masses.

(5.) *Implications for Humanity*: It is not contemplated that there will be a federation of distinct cultures in these United States. The English language and the common traditions that have grown out of the conditions of American life will serve as the nexus of the American civilization. Eventually all groups will merge into a pattern that is large enough to contain them, but it is of great importance that the tempo and the method of amalgamation be free and democratic. From the point of view of the psychic health of the person involved and the morale of the group to which he belongs, it makes all the difference in the world whether he is asked to conform to something predetermined or to a whole which he can have a part in defining. Functioning, self-willing individuals are the constituents of the Good Society. It is the repressed and frustrated man who becomes the camp follower of the demagogue. The voters in the Saar plebiscite several years ago were proof that one can be as keenly frustrated in his group or national expression as in his economic well-being. The Totalitarian führers have exploited for their own vainglorious ends this strong herd compulsion of the peoples. America has the great privilege and the greater opportunity to provide the world an example of an American civilization that is a symphony of national and racial groups—where each group with its own native instruments contributes to the music of the whole. America can answer the chauvinistic blood-and-soil patriotism of Europe and Asia with a new kind of patriotism—"a *contributory* patriotism."* Here is a country, which having developed its physical resources to guarantee, if it will, an economy of abundance, can now turn to the equally important task of developing its spiritual resources. Those who guide our destiny will find behind the once strange skin of the black and yellow man, within the heart of the once sullen and despised foreigner, gifts of grace and intelligence that will lift from humanity the poisonous burden of discontents with which a misguided science has saddled it.

*From H. A. Overstreet's *We Move in New Directions*.—W. W. Norton, New York, 1933.

Man Goes to Jail

O. A. HAMMAND

John Doe living up the street stole $25.00, was convicted of larceny and sentenced to the penitentiary for a term of one year. Stealing $25.00 is still grand larceny in this state*, although a prominent lawyer once confided in me that he could not see anything grand about it. Richard Roe down the street got into a quarrel and beat up one of his neighbors, was convicted of assault and battery, fined $25.00, and sent to the city jail for seven days. Now, please, do not ask why the discrepancy, for no one can answer that question. All that any one can say is that there is nothing consistent nor logical in the criminal law. The fact is that the judge could have sentenced John Doe for five years instead of one, if he had wanted to do so, and could have added a fine of $1,000.00. That is the law.

But there is one thing that we can all agree upon. We need a new jail in this town. I mean a new city jail. The old one is too small. There are not enough cells, and the cells are not large enough. In cells where there should be one or two inmates, there are three or four. The bull pen is so full that they can hardly shut the door. Inmates have to be let out in order to put more in. I mean the county jail, also. The cells are crammed and overflowing into the corridors, and every part of the building is congested.

We have two state penitentiaries; one for the younger and more innocent ones, we might say student criminals; the other for the older crowd who are post-graduates. All of the lifers and death-chamber people are sent to the latter one. But these places are not large enough. There is always the cry for more room to provide for the needs of a growing institution. Some inmates are pardoned, some paroled; once in a while one dies, goes crazy, or commits suicide; a few are hanged, and now and then one goes free on appeal, but there are still too many.

*Iowa.

It would not be fair to give the impression that our town is not a good town, nor that its jails are not as good as the average jail. The county jail has bed clothing but in the city jail the prisoners just take an easy position on the iron shelves. There is another city not so far to the east of us which is proud of its fair name; and in justice, let us say that it has a Chamber of Commerce, labor unions, all sorts of knife-and-fork clubs and uplift societies, a Red Cross Chapter, a Salvation Army, and all the usual varieties of churches; yet a newspaper man from our town who did the country and lived in all of the jails said that this particular jail was exceptionally bad.

But why should we get all stirred up about the jails or the men and women in them so long as *we* are not there? The chances are that we will never be caught but if we are, there is still a chance to buy immunity by a payment in cash.

Back of all this is the never-ending supply of raw material. The courtrooms are full of men and women who may or may not go to jail. The dockets are crowded with indictments against people who may or may never be brought to trial. The police are hunting for others who are accused of crime; and crime, itself, goes merrily on.

There is big crime and little crime. Just the other day in my home town there was printed in the papers a list of the names of seven hundred who had received summons for automobile offenses and who had ignored them. Why should they pay any attention to a summons to appear in court if nothing is to be done to the fellow who disregards it? Why is it that the same fellow who fixed it up or tore up the summons the last time did not do it again? Just what offenses shall we answer in court and what ones shall we ignore and forget?

If you want the whole truth, the American is a natural born lawbreaker. He or she may not be vicious or essentially dishonest or bad, but he or she has been trained for years to disregard every rule and violate every law that can be violated with impunity. If there is a policeman present to enforce the law, then in a reluctant way we will obey it. Otherwise, we will not. If there is not a policeman to enforce the law, then why bother? In that case it is not intended that it shall be enforced, and it certainly will not be observed. If the other fellow can get by with it, I can. If I got by with it before, I can get by with it again. The popular idea of the fellow who observes the law when not required to do so is Mr. Caspar Milquetoast. The idea that there is a duty to the state and to himself to observe the law has never entered the head of Mr. and Mrs. American Citizen.

Twenty-five years ago law enforcement was an academic question with us. Nobody was interested. The New York businessman had figured it out that he could better afford to pay for the graft and crime than to waste his time in politics. Drums began to beat; the boys were put into army camps with bayonets in their hands and taught how to stab straw-men in the belly. Back from the war they came, thousands of them ruined for life. They had learned their lesson too well. Thousands more who had breathed the atmosphere of lawlessness, suspicion, fear, and hate were also ruined for life. Then followed the great depression, and those who had stolen from the government still wanted to steal from the government; and those who had lived off the government still wanted to live off the government. Prices went down, values disappeared, unemployment was widespread, and with the bread lines came crime. Holdup men patrolled the streets at night, and gangmen robbed boxcars, oil stations, and stores.

The answer of the law enforcement bodies was stupid and brutal. Legislatures enacted sterner penalties, judges imposed more severe sentences and police beat men down with their clubs and tortured them in jail by third degree processes. During all this time the public had no idea that there was anything wrong, and did nothing.

Crime may be committed against the State or by the State. One Christmas day a few years ago, my wife and I were staying at a good hotel in Chicago where we had the best of everything; but less than a half a block away, a man without money went into a restaurant, ate fifteen cents worth of food, and attempted to run away. The waiters pursued him and called a policeman. The policeman shot at him with his revolver and followed him on the run, still shooting at him. The man ran down the alley into the street, jumped on a moving street car, but was kicked off, all the time the policeman following and shooting at him. Some of the shots hit the man, and he was hauled off to the hospital in an ambulance.

Out on the West Coast, Mooney and Billings were convicted on a charge of killing by throwing a bomb, and after many years they are still in jail, although it has now been established with very little doubt that the State of California convicted these men by means of perjured testimony. The case has been up and down in the Superior Court and the Supreme Court of California, in the legislature, before the Governor, in state politics, and twice in the Supreme Court of the United States.

Massachusetts could not endure the Italian-Portuguese immigration so they clamped down on a poor fish peddler, and Sacco and Vanzetti were hanged. The people of America do not believe that they were guilty, nor do the people of the world believe that they were guilty. There were protests all over Europe at what they called the murder of Sacco and Vanzetti. On the night of the execution some one threw a bomb into the Wilson Garage in Geneva, Switzerland, which they identified as an American concern, located within a block of the old League of Nations building. It was the only way they knew of making a protest.

There are plenty of bad criminals. One of the most desperate gangsters that this country has ever produced went on his way for years without any serious resistance, and there was no way to stop him until he failed to pay his income tax; then a way was discovered to send him to "the rock" where he collapsed.

The attitude of the law toward an individual charged with crime is not exclusively an American idea; its origin is English, but the emphasis is American. The law is jealous in guarding his rights. Before any proceeding can be brought there must first be a crime committed and discovered, and a charge filed. Then the defendant must be arrested, brought into court, and indicted by a grand jury. This does not mean that he is guilty; but only that the evidence against him when undisputed is sufficient to justify the State in trying him for the offense. The State must furnish him an attorney if he is unable to hire one for himself, he may consult with his attorney before he pleads to the indictment, and is entitled to have the names of witnesses against him and a copy of their testimony before the grand jury.

In the trial he may testify for himself; but is at liberty to sit in the courtroom and not say a word if he does not wish to do so. He has the right to challenge any number of witnesses for cause, and make the statutory number of peremptory challenges. A witness who has not testified before the grand jury cannot testify in the trial unless the statutory notice is given to the defendant together with a copy of the testimony which the witness will give. The defendant has the right to object to any part of the testimony of a witness against him and obtain a ruling of the court on the question of its admissibility, and, of course, any evidence which is incompetent may be excluded or stricken from the record. It is necessary for the whole twelve jurors to agree in order to find him guilty and if one holds out, the jury will disagree and the case must be tried over again unless the prosecuting attorney decides to dismiss it. If once cleared from the charge, the defendant is free. If he is convicted, he still has the right to make a motion for a new trial or appeal to a higher court. His conviction may be reversed and set aside; and if so, he is free. Or the case may be sent back for a new trial, in which instance the State must go through every stage of the prosecution again. The liberty of the individual is so safeguarded by legal mechanism that it is difficult to convict a defendant even though guilty.

The utter failure to convict has led to the imposition of severe and unreasonable penalties by legislative bodies; and has contributed to the brutality and torture of the third degree and the shooting down of criminals in the streets by law-enforcement officers, rather than wait for the slow and uncertain processes of the law.

It is strange that legislatures or parole officers do not realize what is going on, and where it is that our present system falls down. They know that many cases never come to trial but they do not understand why. They know that most of the big offenders get away but they do not know why. They know that most criminals are released before their terms expire but they do not know why. In the year 1936 there were 6,767 persons arrested for criminal homicide and only 194 executed. This is what America calls law enforcement.

The fact is that the severity of our law (and the brutality of the third degree as too often practised) is a relic of barbarism. The jury knows that the defendant is guilty but there is some man or woman on the panel who refuses to be a party to a judicial murder. At no place along the line do the law-enforcement officers get the support of the public. Reduce the severity of the statutes, simplify the procedure, reëxamine the whole system of the evidence, penalties, and practice, clean up and humanize the police methods and jails, and a long step forward will have been taken.

How can this be done? It can be done by enough combined intelligence to visualize an improved social order and to enact a revised legal system. The ordinary legislature cannot do it. It can be done by a crime commission representing the best brains of the country. Such a group should include a few lawyers but not too many of them; they should not be permitted to dominate the commission. Lawyers are often wonderful men, and their presence is required to settle conflict of laws and constitutional questions, but they look to the past and not to the future. They are more interested in what the law *is* than what it *should be*.

Select a group of twenty-five, including two judges, two lawyers, two editors, two college professors, two doctors, a minister, a rabbi, and a priest; a merchant, banker, farmer, manufacturer, miner, mechanic, a legislator, parole officer, sheriff, juvenile officer, police officer, and penitentiary warden. Set this group to work with instructions to get all the information they can from any source, and to eliminate all blue laws and all war laws and everything which conflicts with the Bill of Rights; to leave out all patriotic, political, and religious "crimes"; to omit all factional and vindictive things, all vague and glittering generalities and all trifling and pestiferous things; and produce some sane and reasonable laws that can be enforced and that ought to be enforced.

Let them follow this up with a code of practice and procedure that is consistent with the problems of the present day and which will function. When the work is finished, turn it over to the states as a model code; not to be forced upon them, but to be used as a guide if they want it. This will not solve all of the problems of the criminal world, but it will make the judicial system workable and a more useful factor in the relief of present conditions. Do this, and it may not be necessary for any young man and his good wife, with their little son, to leave their native America and take up a new residence in a foreign land, to be free from the fear of kidnapers.

The Seattle People's Church

FRED W. SHORTER

What a modern church can do in the field of social justice and civil liberties was vividly dramatized by the Church of the People, Seattle, Washington, in the month of May. It was the fourth anniversary of the organization of the church.

The episodes indicate the character of the contribution this church has made to the community during its short life. The first, entitled "The Rift," depicted the effect of the murals upon the conservative church members of the old Congregational church. There was the heavy supporter who objected because the paintings too vividly set forth the same pernicious doctrines that the minister expressed in the pulpit. He had borne with the sermons but the portrayal on the walls was too much for him. There was the kind and sentimental lady who bemoaned the fact that the church was being made a place of controversy when it should be a place for comfort and consolation. The plea of the young artists that the pictures depicted real conditions could not stop the inevitable rift.

The significance of the murals was brought home afresh in the face of present conditions. The futility of the disarmament conference, in which the conferees hypocritically gambled with death and sawed off a small slice of the big guns, has been proved. Today even the hypocrisy has been cast aside and nations are openly arming and preparing for slaughter. The Hitler crucifixion picture is even more poignant. Fascist crucifixion of culture is even more pronounced today than four years ago. The lynching of the Negro has more significance now because of the sabotage by southern Democrats and reactionary Republicans of the anti-lynching bill. Further significance was given locally because at the very moment of this presentation three policemen were on trial for beating to death a Negro.

The second episode, entitled "Indecision," portrayed the struggle individuals had in deciding to cast in their lot with a group that was openly anti-capitalistic. To proclaim publicly that capitalism is inimical to the ideals of the kingdom of God and to demand assent to such a statement was too strong a step for some followers to take. The result was division within families, the husband or wife determined to go along and the mate afraid of the consequences. There was some indecision, too, in the group itself. That indecision, however, was as to the best way in which to express the ideals so bravely proclaimed. When they did move they found that they were hindered at almost every turn. Halls were closed to them and, finally, by sacrificial effort, they were forced to secure a building of their own. They named it, at the suggestion of Dr. Sydney Strong, "Independence Hall" and placed upon its pillars, Life, Truth, Justice, and Freedom.

The third episode, entitled "Unity and a Common Purpose" portrayed the welding of the group through social action into an informed and consecrated church. Scenes depicted concrete action in four different strikes. To the strikers in a nearby coal mining community the church sent a wagonload of provisions. For the longshoremen, the church organized the first mass

meeting in order to give to the public the longshoremen's side of the controversy. In the Guild strike against the Hearst Post-Intelligencer, the church officially joined the picket line and gave over a hundred dollars to the strike fund.

One scene dramatized the "missionary" work of the church: donations to various causes, such as to the Harlan County miners, Tom Mooney, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Commonwealth College, Civil Liberties Union, Loyalist Spain, and China. Instead of the usual benevolence fund this church has a social action fund, money that is earmarked for such causes as those mentioned.

What many people consider the most significant contribution of the church is the maintenance of a weekly forum. This was dramatized by the use of a microphone and loud speakers. The voices of the most prominent of the forum speakers came over the air. When brought together in this way the breadth of subject matter and the caliber of the speakers were very impressive. Such men and women as Fred Henderson and Jennie Lee of Great Britain, Anna Louise Strong, William Pickens, Willard Uphaus, Benjamin Marsh, Kirby Page, Harold Loeb, Dr. Tao, Mary Van Kleeck, and Dr. James Myers were among those who spoke. To New Yorkers or Bostonians this may not seem remarkable, but when one recalls that this church is in Seattle and is a small group, one realizes that to have had these and many more speakers of like caliber is an accomplishment.

But more than the quality of the speakers is the spirit in which these forums are conducted. The assumption is maintained that in an open arena truth can grapple with error and win. This assumption has caused the group some trouble with doctrinaire people such as Communists. They demand that the forum be a platform for propaganda. Especially excited are they when a Trotskyist, such as Dr. Karl Korsch, is invited to speak. The church has resisted this with such effect that propagandists for the present Stalinist regime have dubbed the forum itself Trotskyist. Those who have attended these forums consistently during the four years realize that they have been the means of clarifying ideas. The critical faculty has been developed so that it would be impossible for propagandists to go unchallenged.

The climax of the dramatization was a simple service emphasizing the religious character of the organization. It is a church and not a political party or pressure group. This has been difficult for many people who have been attracted to the church to understand. As a church it welcomes to membership any person, irrespective of race, color, creed, or political affiliation, who will subscribe to its purpose and principles—stated as follows:

> We are a fellowship dedicated to the consummation of the new society as portrayed in the teachings of Jesus. We believe that the principles of that society, namely, reverence for personality and the unity of the human family, cannot be fulfilled in a social order based on profit, but only in a coöperative democracy organized for the common good and in which production is for the common need. We pledge ourselves to strive for the realization of that ideal. As guides to life and conduct we accept and assert the supremacy of conscience; intellectual integrity; freedom of speech and assemblage; and the equality of all men irrespective of race, color, or creed. For inspiration we look to Jesus of Nazareth and to all great prophets of love and justice.

The Study Table

In Honor of Rufus Jones

CHILDREN OF LIGHT: *Edited by Howard H. Brinton. 416 pp. New York: The Macmillan Company.* $3.50.

This volume of essays was published in honor of Rufus Jones on the occasion of his seventy-fifth birthday. It is a valuable contribution to the history of Christianity and is worthy of being presented to one of America's great Christian leaders. We cannot have too many books about the history of the Friends; and this book was needed. It takes up points in the development of Quaker thought and learning that have hitherto been neglected. Among these points are investigations into the life of Edward Byllynge, a contemporary of George Fox; Hebraica and the Jews in early Quaker interest; Latin works of Friends; investigation into the career of Joseph Hewes, the Quaker signer of the Declaration of Independence; and further research into the political thought of William Penn. The contributors are Herbert Wood, Francis Taylor, Catherine Miles, L. Violet Holdsworth, John L. Nickalls, Henry J. Cadbury, Anna Cox Brinton, William I. Hull, Charles F. Jenkins, Arthur J. Mekeel, Isabel Grubb, Harlow Lindley, Janet P. Whitney, Walter C. Woodward, and Howard H. Brinton.

There is appended to the book a bibliography of the writings of Rufus Jones, in whose honor these investigations were made. The book at once represents the scholarship associated with Rufus Jones' name and the high Christian character which is his. No one can read these brilliant essays without an intensified appreciation of practical Christianity. For that is what the Friends have continued to exemplify. They have been a spiritually-minded minority that has leavened the whole lump. Gradually through their ardent pacifist patriotism, through their scholarship, and through their humanitarianism, they have taught the world that the Christian way is the better way. In the forefront of this movement stands Rufus Jones without whom the world would have been infinitely poorer, and without whom this book would not have been written.

* * *

A Regional Novel

THE SHARECROPPER. *By Charlie May Simon. 247 pp. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company.*

This is the first novel by the distinguished writer of children's books. In private life the author, Charlie May Simon, is the wife of John Gould Fletcher, Arkansas' noted imagist poet. With this novel, Miss Simon takes her place among America's regional authors.

The plot of *The Sharecropper* is the life of a family among the lowliest of present-day Americans, the sharecroppers of the South. The author takes an objective position and points out clearly the injustice meted out to the poverty-stricken "forgotten" men and women. The social injustice is so clearly portrayed that the reader must be constrained to do some moralizing for himself. The account is sincere and authen-

tic, and told by one who has seen her characters and lived among them.

The novel opens with the marriage of Bill Bradley to Donie Goodwin. Bill is a sharecropper and the son of a sharecropper. After the shivaree, Bill and Donie go to make their home in the cheerless cabin of Bill's family. In one corner of the kitchen Donie pastes colored pictures on the wall so she can feel she has a home of her own. During the hot summer the family toil at the cotton crop, to have only one hundred and twenty dollars for their year's work.

Here is an unforgettable picture of the sharecropper in the South today. The situation's only bright light which, of course, Miss Simon does not mention is that interesting experiment started in 1926 by Sherwood Eddy, the Delta Coöperative Farm. All who are interested in America's forgotten men and women should read this book; then, lest they be too disheartened, let them visit Sam Franklin, Jr., the able and efficient manager of the Delta Coöperative Farm.

C. A. Hawley.

Augustus

Augustus. *By John Buchan. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company.* $4.50.

And still the mocking pageant of dictators continues. For now, with much less prolixity (and, alas, with somewhat less poetry) than in *Montrose, Minto,* and *Oliver Cromwell,* Lord Tweedsmuir, already familiar to our readers as John Buchan, evokes from Roman shadows their founder and master builder, Octavian, breathing fresh living vitality into the spectral memory that was called Augustus. Prefaced by no such symphonic prelude as brave Oliver, and with but a brief flash-back to the Republic, instead this Roman Caesar is plunged by his manipulator almost instantly into that maelstrom of assassination, tumult, and civil war. The mightiest Julius, his uncle, would-be weaver of a world, fallen at the foot of Pompey's statue, forthwith commences the world-wide duel for empire between Octavian and Antony, which occupies almost half the production. When at last, to a dying throb of eastern kettledrums and western trumpets, the curtain falls on Actium, a brief pause is permitted for mental collection—then it rises once more on perhaps the grandest act in historical tradition: the reconstruction of ruined Rome by the skilled hands of Augustus, destined to endure for five centuries and to pass at last through barbaric transition into the Europe of today . . . the whole comprising a spectacle which would but lose in majesty by being described in our usual stereotyped stage assemblage.

Undoubtedly an overwhelming task, this work which Canada's governor-general has stolen time from his duties to perform; comparable, if not quite commensurate, with the labors of his hero. But in swift, concise, soldierly fashion, Mr. Buchan has done his work well; more, he has recaptured, as vividly as possible at this distant date, the lineaments of Augustus, long hidden by time and textbooks. They gleam down upon us, those caesarian features, with a cold hard impenetrable brilliance like that of Sirius; remote from our passions but perfectly capable of comprehending our problems; they regard us steadily and as a whole —but the message which comes from their mute lips (although delivered with perfection by the hierophant of English fascism) we cannot fathom or, if momentarily made clear, remains remote from our acceptance as those far-off stars themselves.

Robert Schaller

The Field

(*Continued from page* 178)

Keep America Out of War

The Chicago Committee to Keep America Out of War presents a proposed minimum program to be used as a basis for uniting as many groups and individuals as possible in an effort to forestall another war. The order in which these items appear on this list does not necessarily indicate their order of importance.

1. A Referendum which would give the American people the democratic right to vote on participation in any foreign war.

2. Abandonment of all existing plans for industrial mobilization (such as the May-Sheppard bill) and defeat of all new plans for universal conscription, thus informing our government that the American people will not support war abroad nor tolerate war dictatorship at home.

3. The immediate removal of all American fighting forces from China and other war areas and the evacuation of Americans from war zones unless they choose to stay at their own risk.

4. No armament program which involves sacrificing American lives in defense of American nationals or property in foreign territory.

5. The support of all constructive measures in the field of international economic coöperation, rather than national isolation.

6. Opposition to any alliance or secret understanding with any nation or group of nations for declared or undeclared war.

7. A determination to seek our well-being and prosperity by eliminating unemployment, poverty, and bad living conditions at home, rather than in war wages, war prices and war profits.

Automobile Speeding

The following appeared as an editorial in a recent issue of the Augusta (Maine) *Union*:

I saw you barely miss a little boy on a tricycle this afternoon, and heard you yell, "Get out of the way! Don't you know any better than to ride in the street?" He didn't answer because he hasn't learned to talk yet. So I'm going to answer for him.

No, the little boy doesn't know any better than to ride his tricycle in the street. He has been warned not to, but little boys don't always heed warnings. Some adults don't, especially traffic warnings; for example, the one limiting the speed of automobiles in city streets.

I am going to tell you something about that little boy: He has a mother who endured considerable inconvenience, anxiety, and suffering to bring him into the world. He has a father who worked hard and made many sacrifices to make him healthy and happy. The supreme purpose of their lives is to have their boy grow up to be a useful and prosperous man.

Now stop a minute and think. I know your minutes are valuable and I know it will be hard for you to think. But try. If you should kill a child, how would you feel facing the parents? What excuse could you possibly offer Him whose kingdom is made up of little children?

Children, my hasty friend, were here long before you or your automobile were ever thought of. All the automobiles on earth are not worth the life of one little boy on a tricycle. Any competent garage mechanic can put a car together, however badly it's smashed, but nobody on earth can put a child together once its life has been crushed out. We don't know what that child may some day be. But we know what you are, and it's unimportant. We could get along without you, but we can't spare a single little boy on this street.